CANUCK LAW

Reporting That You're Not Getting Elsewhere (Do Your Own Research To Verify)

NOVEMBER 3, 2018 BY RONNIE

# ”Migrant Caravan” Lawyers Sue For Right to Legally Invade U.S.

Migrant Caravan - Masses Of Illegals 01 (2018)

Migrant Caravan - Illegals Demanding To Be Let In 02

(Well organized and well funded economic migrants planning to invade the U.S. en masse. Original videos are here and here.)

## The Court Challenge

Liberals tend to deflect legitimate questions as ”language”

Liberals and open-border globalists do this regularly. When asked direct questions they usually deflect rather than give direct answers. They don’t challenge the facts, but rather play word games, calling it ”fearful and divisive language”.

Now, to the obvious. These are not refugees at all. They are economic migrants, who are well organized, trying to get into the U.S. This is an invasion, one that has clearly been thought through. As you can see in the videos, they have supplies waiting for them at the end of each day, and for ”refugees”, they look like they have have a good life.

Just when the story couldn’t get more absurd, thehill.com released this article, showing that a lawsuit had actually been filed on behalf of the so-called refugees. Being a class action lawsuit, it opens the door for many more plaintiffs. We will go through the main points.

For this to make any sense, at least 5 completely wrong assertions must be correct:

(1) That everyone in the world has the right to come to the United States and claim asylum. Not to the first safe country available, but to the U.S. specifically.

(2) That the protections of U.S. law, such as the 5th amendment apply to everyone, everywhere. You don’t have to be a citizen, or legal resident, or even on U.S. soil.

(3) That obviously fraudulent claims for asylum must be taken seriously.

(4) That so-called ”refugees” can send their kids ahead and demand the U.S. provide for them. Or even more generally that the U.S. must financially provide for anyone who enters.

(5) That the U.S. does not have the right to have sovereign borders, regardless of security threats.

As an aside, it cannot be overstated that the overwhelming majority are ***not*** refugees. Many openly admit they are coming for a better life, and better employment prospects. Further, given the amount of support they have on the journey, and a legal team filing suit in the U.S., the claims are absurd.

## Claim: Anyone Can Enter U.S.

Lawyers for the invading economic migrants submit that:

> Trump’s professed and enacted policy towards thousands of caravanners seeking asylum in the United States is shockingly unconstitutional. President Trump continues to abuse the law, including constitutional rights, to deter Central Americans from exercising their lawful right to seek asylum in the United States, and the fact that innocent children are involved matters none to President Trump.

See the U.S./Canadian safe country agreement as an example. Refugees are expected to apply for asylum in the first safe country they reach.

This ”caravan” originated in Honduras. The migrants then travelled through Guatemala,

making it the country they should have filed for asylum in. But they never did. They then forced their way into Mexico, which would be the second country they arrived in. Mexico in fact offered asylum and work permits, but the offer was rejected.

This group is not seeking a safe country. They are ”shopping” for a richer one, one with more handouts and benefits. They are not refugees, but economic migrants.

As an aside, the same thing is happening in Canada. Our ”Paper Canadian” and FGM apologist of an Immigration Minister, gets offended when people point out that ”refugees” from the U.S. are just economic migrants.

## Claim: 5th Amendment Applies

Lawyers for the invading economic migrants submit that:

> This case arises under the Fifth Amendment to the United States Constitution, the Administrative Procedures Act (APA), and the Declaratory Judgment Act,
> inter alia
> .
> . The court has subject matter jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1331. 7. Personal Jurisdiction is proper because Defendants transact business in this District and thus are subject to personal jurisdiction in this Court.
> Case 1:18-cv-02534 Document 1 Filed 11/01/18 Page 7 of 32
> VENUE
> 8. Venue is proper under 28 U.S.C. § 1391 because at least one of the Defendants is subject to personal jurisdiction in this district with regards to this action.

Information on the 5th Amendment is given here, but in laymen’s terms, it provides many legal protections to people.

But here, the lawyers claim that the group, who isn’t even on U.S. soil. It says that they ”transact business” and at least ”one person is subject to personal jurisdiction.” This is incredibly vague, and again, being a class action suit allows for many more plaintiffs to join in.

The U.S. Constitution is meant to provide legal protection to people ***inside*** the U.S., preferably there legally. But this argument suggests that anyone ***wanting to go to*** the U.S. should get the same protections.

## 5. Claim: Must Take All Seriously

Lawyers for the invading economic migrants submit that:

> Immigrants who indicate an intention to apply for asylum or indicates a fear of persecution must be referred for a “credible fear interview”:
> .
> If an immigration officer determines that an alien (other than an alien described in subparagraph (F)) who is arriving in the United States or is described in clause (iii) is inadmissible under section 1182(a)(6)(C) or 1182(a)(7) of this title and the alien indicates either an intention to apply for asylum under section 1158 of this title or a fear of persecution, the officer shall refer the alien for an interview by an asylum officer under subparagraph (B). 8 U.S.C. § 1225 (b)(1)(A)(ii).
> .
> Following a credible fear interview, if an asylum officer determines that an asylum seeker has a “credible fear of persecution,” then there is a significant possibility that the asylum seeker will be granted asylum

Many videos of these ”refugees” are available on YouTube. They openly admit that they are going to the United States for economic reasons, such as work and social services. Not having a job, or poor living conditions are not valid grounds for claiming asylum.

Interesting to note: If all these migrants were going to the U.S. for a better life, doesn’t it refute this claim, that so-called refugees coming to Canada from New York or Minnesota are doing so fraudulently?

## Claim: U.S. Is Obligated To Pay For The Children Of The Invaders

Lawyers for the invading economic migrants submit that:

> The care and custody of minors in Immigration Custody is controlled by the Flores Agreement, a copy of which is attached hereto as Exhibit 1. That agreement applies to all minors, including those who are taken into custody with their parents. Flores v. Lynch, 828 F.3d 898 (9th Cir. 2016). That agreement provides that minors must be held in facilities run by licensed programs and that are "safe and sanitary and are consistent with [Defendants'] concern for the particular vulnerability of minors." Ex. 1, ¶¶ 12.A, 14. These facilities must "provide access to toilets and sinks, drinking water … adequate temperature control and ventilation adequate supervision to protect minors from others, and contact with family."

While the Flores Agreement does set out certain conditions to be met, it seems that the invading migrants are taking full advantage of it. Arguably the children are being used as weapons, as ways for arm twisting to get more benefits. The adults will of course, demand to be locked up with their children.

The Flores Agreement was never meant to be used as a tool to facilitate mass illegal immigration, but that is exactly what the lawyers are trying to do.

## Claim: U.S. Has No Border Rights

Lawyers for the invading economic migrants submit that:

> On top of the above, Trump has repeatedly professed that the caravan people will not get into this county, and just as significant, Trump has taken meaningful steps to ensure the world that this is his policy position/initiative, meaningful steps such as deploying thousands of active military troops to the border, waiting on caravan persons to arrive. The legal problem with Trump's plan to stop caravan persons from entering this country is that Plaintiffs are seeking asylum, and Trump simply cannot stop them from legally doing so by using military, or anyone.

Interesting claim. The U.S. apparently has no right to defend its own border by this logic. Anyone can come into the country. Anyone can take children and demand free food and

accomodation. And it doesn’t matter how many people come, and if it completely overwhelms the immigration system. The rights of America to defend itself don’t seem to matter.

## How Does This Play Out?

Unclear, at least to me. The lawsuit seems bogus on its face, makes bizarre claims, and is openly contradicted by the ”refugees” themselves.

The invaders’ lawyers repeatedly conflate laws meant to protect people inside the U.S. with those wanting to enter the U.S.

One additional detail, the suit seems to want to cover anyone who will attempt to cross at a later date:

> Plaintiffs seek to represent the following class:
> All persons (1) who are Mexican, Central American, or South American citizens (2) who are travelling to the United States or have attempted entry into the United States, whether at a designated port of entry or not, since October 31, 2018, and (3) who are seeking asylum or intending to seek asylum within the United States

To be clear, not only will this not be the last ”caravan” to try to enter the U.S., but at least 2 more are up already.

Trump’s best move would be to send as many troops to the border as needed and repel this invasion at all costs. Open fire if need be.

Update to the Story:
By it’s own admission, the United Nations is actually helping the “caravan”. In essence, it is helping the economic migrants ***INVADE*** the United States.

---

> ***The United Nations Migration Agency, IOM, is providing support and assistance to migrants crossing Central America in several self-styled caravans, while expressing concern over “the stress and demands” they are placing on host***

***countries.***

***All migrants must be respected, regardless of their migratory status – IOM Chief of Mission in Mexico***

---

The U.N. needs to go entirely. More on that in an upcoming article.

**BORDERS (CANADA), CENTRAL AMERICA, CONSTITUTIONAL, GLOBALISM, HUMAN RIGHTS, IMMIGRATION (CANADA), NGO/CS, SOUTH AMERICA, TRAFFICKING, SMUGGLING, CHILD EXPLOITATION, UN/WHO, US, ZIONISM**

## 2 Replies to ""Migrant Caravan" Lawyers Sue For Right to Legally Invade U.S."

**Glen Walushka**

**NOVEMBER 6, 2018 AT 3:39 PM**

The old adage 'If you repeat a falsehood enough times over, eventually others will embrace it as true' seems applicable here. To drive in the thin edge of the wedge is what is being sought.

The petitioners' claim of 'rights' to the US contrary to existing statutes and argued by globalist lawyers and backers is not necessarily meant to succeed this time. Instead, the organizers seek to create the first 'crack in the dam'.

Virtually all legal arguments in this case may be ultimately rejected by a series of court decisions, but it is likely some small, seemingly insignificant, concession in law may be granted to placate the petitioners.

And thus it begins. Next time a similar case is brought forward, the first barrier has been overcome based on precedent. Possibly a second concession in law is made to further appease the plaintiffs.

Ultimately, the sum total of the 'minor concessions' gains enough credibility to challenge the validity of the statutes themselves. At that point, the repetitive challenges have amassed sufficient force to overcome inertia and move a well intended law, designed to protect and

enforce sovereignty, to a status wherein the legislation no longer has any historical pretext that cannot be successfully challenged.

This may become the first significant test of the current US Supreme Court, with the additions of Kavanaugh and Gorsuch on the bench. Their combined presence may well be the ultimate defence against the creeping globalism that is overtaking much of Western Civilization.

Did the fortuitous election of Donald Trump and his subsequent ‘originalist’ Supreme Court appointments enshrine another generation of assured sovereignty and the preservation of fundamental constitutional principles? Is that why the Democrats fought so hard, unethically and abandoning all reasonable principled behaviour in the process, in order to prevent Kavanaugh’s confirmation?

I believe that will prove to be the case. In Canada (and elsewhere) however, weakening sovereignty protecting legislation is being implemented by governments who are abrogating their fiduciary trust and sworn duties to their citizens as they chase a fictitious globalist panacea promoted by a corrupt, self-serving UN.

At the moment, the USA may be one of the last bastions of basic individual rights and freedoms. It is good to see Australia, Poland and others starting to join the US in rejecting the Compact on Migration. Will Canada eventually see the light?

Not until our proclaimed ‘Post National’ corrupted Prime Minister is soundly and decisively defeated, never to return.

### Editor

**NOVEMBER 6, 2018 AT 4:36 PM**

Hello Glen,

It is a valid argument, that it might lead to concessions. Lawyers are arguing that protections for asylum claimants ”wishing to go to” the U.S. should be treated the same as claimants ”already in” the U.S. And children are being used as tools. The suit is ridiculous, but if granted, then anyone in the world — anywhere — will have the right to have a claim heard in the U.S.

The U.N. routinely ignores the fact that they are not refugees, but rather economic migrants. They finance fraudulent legal claims.

There are a number of countries rejecting the UN migration compact. More on that in a later

piece.

And yes, we will make sure Canada sees the light.